DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 491 EC 093 212

AUTHOR	Berger, Barbara
TITLE	Teacher Training and Program Development in Motor Education for Handicapped Children in New York City Elementary Schools. September 1974-June 1975. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Parent Education; *Perceptual Motor Coordination; *Program Evaluation; Regular Class Placement; *Sensory Training
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Evaluated was a program designed to improve the perceptual, motor/sensory skills of 1,002 handicapped children (5-21 years old) in New York City schools. Program components included motor education training for students, inservice training of classroom teachers and periodic teacher workshops, and parent education through workshops and specially designed training materials. Findings showed that students made significant gains in motor skills as a result of training; that a positive training effect was also evident for classroom teachers; and that the program proved to have a comparable positive impact on parents as well. Recommendations were made that services be enlarged to include additional classes of learning disabled and blind students; and that the scope of teacher training be expanded. (Appended materials include sample data report forms; and copies of the Motor Proficiency Screening Test, the teacher questionnaire, and the parent questionnaire.) (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136491

EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function No. 09-56611

TEACHER TRAINING AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN MOTOR EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN NEW YORK CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

September 1974- June 1975

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Barbara Berger, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title VI-B Education of the Handicapped Act and performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

EC093212

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. THE PROGRAM.....page 1

II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.....page 2

III. FINDINGS.....page 4

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....page 9

V. EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT.....page 11

Appendix

I. STATISTICAL DATA
MIR Report Forms
Data Loss Sheet

II. INSTRUMENTS
Motor Proficiency Screening Test
Teacher Questionnaire
Parent Questionnaire

List of Tables

I. RESPONSE FREQUENCIES AND MEAN ITEM VALUES ON THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE.....page 6

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

This program was specifically designed to improve the perceptual, motor/sensory skills of handicapped youngsters in NYC schools. The pupil population consisted chiefly of youngsters enrolled in CRMD classes , as well as other groups of handicapped children, selected on the basis of recommendations from the Bureau director and school principals requesting service in their schools.

The primary goals of training were to promote physical fitness of pupils, specific perceptual motor abilities and overall motor proficiency. Secondary aims were:to upgrade pupil motivation and self -confidence through success experience; reinforce basic cognitive concepts through motor learning. The training procedure consisted of two experimental classes a week , conducted by project resource specialists working in the schools. Methods of instruction included a specially designed motor education curriculum and a variety of action type, instructional materials. A master teacher provided supervision on a regular basis, visiting these classes and consulting with resource specialists.

Teacher training was another basic component of this program. This feature involved the participation of pupils' classroom teachers who attended the training sessions to observe, learn and assist the resource specialists. Periodic teacher training workshops were also sponsored by project staff as well as regularly scheduled follow-up visits to teachers participating the preceding year. Thus, a consistent effort was made to maximize carry-over of training into

the classrooms.

A third component was a parent education thrust. This phase included parent education, demonstration workshops held at intervals throughout the training period, and instructional materials for parental guidance and assistance to pupils at home.

The duration of the program was for the school year, beginning in September 1974 and ending in June 1975.

Chapter II: EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The assessment of program efficacy was organized around the following evaluation objectives:

(1) To determine whether pupils, as a result of training, would demonstrate significant gains in motor proficiency. The methodology consisted of pre and post training comparisons of pupil performance on the Motor Proficiency Screening Test, an individually administered measure developed by BCRMD . Pupils were initially tested at the start of the program in September and again at the end of May by the resource specialists, who instructed them. Data analysis employed the sign test for large samples.

(2) To determine whether teachers of experimental classes would demonstrate significant gains in their understanding and knowledge of program methods and problems. The evaluation procedure was to compare teachers' scores on a pre and post questionnaire, developed for this purpose by the project staff. Testing was conducted at the start of the program in September and again at the end of May. For this phase of the evaluation , the same non-parametric

procedure was employed to analyze the data.

(3) To assess parental reactions toward the program in order to determine the extent to which parents were favorably impressed. This objective was a departure from the original proposal objective---to determine whether parents would demonstrate significant gains in knowledge of the program and ability to assist their children at home. Because of the obvious difficulty of obtaining valid data on parent behavior in the home, this objective was revised and modified in the final evaluation design. The revision substituted parent attitudes as the primary focus of the evaluation , in line with objective # 3 above. The assessment procedure was a parent questionnaire, indexing parental reactions to the program, administered to parents attending one of the parent workshops given during the course of training. Since some exposure to the program was required in order for parents to react to it, no pretest was indicated and the evaluation was limited to a single administration of this questionnaire. Data analysis in this case consisted of a descriptive summary of response patterns, illustrating frequencies of choices for each item category and mean item scores for the parent group and identification of salient trends .

(4) To determine the extent to which the program, as actually implemented, was congruent with the program as described in the proposal. This part of the evaluation was based on the consultant evaluator's field observations of the program in operation, attendance at teacher training and parent workshops, interviews with project staff and the resultant findings reported by the consultant.

There were no limitations imposed on the evaluation design other than the expected data loss, amounting to approximately ten percent in the pupil sample and fifty percent in the teacher sample. However, the sample size was still quite adequate in each group, despite factors accounting for data loss--- pupil absences, illness, transfers and occasional difficulties in testing youngsters, as well as teacher mobility and failure to cooperate in returning the questionnaire.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

Findings relevant to pupil gains in moter proficiency (evaluation objective#1)indicated that better than seventy five percent increased their scores on the post training proficiency measure.The sign test analysis yielded a z score of 2.55 and a probability of .0054(one-tail), documenting a highly significant training effect.

Results germane to teacher understanding and knowledge of the program(evaluation objective #2) revealed a uniform and extreme positive effect of training, with every subject in the sample of ninety six showing a gain in post-test scores. Since an effect of this magnitude is the most extreme that can occur, the evidence is strong that in a comparable sample of this size every subject would show a gain, substantiating a rejection of the null hypothesis beyond the .001 level.

The assessment of parental reactions to the program(evaluation objective #3) likewise reveals a uniformly positive outcome across the board, with the entire parent sample responding

favorably to all of the items in the questionnaire. In fact, there are no negative ratings on any item and a high proportion of extreme positive ratings (obtaining for approximately forty percent of the sample on six of the twelve items). Inspection of Table I, which illustrates the response profile for this instrument , reveals some salient trends. One is the finding that item #1 (perceived benefits of the program re improving child's physical coordination and skills) and item # 2 (perceived value of the program re motivating a more positive attitude toward recreation) get the highest percentages of extreme positive ratings, sixty three and fifty eight percent respectively. Another notable trend is the relatively high proportion of the sample, approximately thirty three percent, who are undecided about the program's merits re upgrading academic achievement (item #7). These trends indicate that parents tend to be most enthusiastic about the program's physical assistance to their children and most uncertain about the relevance of training for improving their youngsters' academic skills.

The findings with respect to the congruence between the actual operation of the program and proposal goals (evaluation objective #4) follow. Each aspect of the program , observed in the twenty schools, visited by the consultant evaluator, was consistent with the proposal as regards all three components. Pupil and teacher training and parent education aspects were all in line with the proposal specifications.

Table I

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES AND MEAN ITEM VALUES

ON THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Item #	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Value
1. Frequency	63	64	5			
Choice Value	4	3	2	1	0	3.4
2. Frequency	58	67	7			
C. V.	4	3	2	1	0	3.3
3.Frequency			3	99	30	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.2
4.Frequency	35	88	9			
C. V.	4	3	2	1	0	3.1
5.Frequency			3	89	40	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.2
6.Frequency			3	84	45	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.3
7.Frequency	40	62	30			
C. V.	4	3	2	1	0	3.1
8.Frequency	52	75	5			
C. V.	4	3	2	1	0	3.3
9.Frequency			2	73	57	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.4
10.Frequency			4	80	48	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.8
11.Frequency	55	75	2			
C. V.	4	3	2	1	0	3.4
12.Frequency			4	78	50	
C. V.	0	1	2	3	4	3.3

NOTE: The higher the choice value, the more favorable the response.

The following recommendations , generated by the preceding evaluation, have been incorporated into the program this year:

(1) Introduction of a regularly structured schedule of intervisitations by resource specialists. This suggestion has been carried out by way of scheduling intervisitations once a month, affording resource specialists an opportunity to compare and learn from methods used by their colleagues, and find out what other staff members are doing.

(2) Inclusion of more frequent staff meetings to encourage professional sharing and exchange of ideas. This recommendation has been followed up with project staff conferences twice a month, serving as a forum for disseminating new techniques and materials.

(3) Provision of stronger follow-up assistance to classroom teachers in terms of providing regular lesson plans. This recommendation has been carried out through the development of a motor education curriculum during the past year, which includes specific lesson plans, to be available by September '75.

(4) Systematization of resource specialists' teaching schedules so that each type of class is visited the same number of times each week, in all districts. This has been done by way of implementing a teaching schedule, comprising two school visits to all classes each week.

(5) Utilization of video-tape for presentation of teaching methods to classroom teachers. This recommendation has resulted in videotaping of several demonstration lessons, which can be

employed for this purpose in the future.

From the standpoint of training facilities, those observed by the consultant were satisfactory. In most instances, the gym was available for training sessions, providing the necessary space and freedom for a motor education program. The instructional methods and materials were outstanding with respect to their effectiveness in stimulating and challenging pupils within the limits of their capabilities , and making the training experience very enjoyable for them. Both materials and instructional approach reflected sound educational practice and appropriateness for the specific learning objectives of this program.

It was evident that services were being provided to the target population intended. Classes receiving instruction included the various categories of handicapped youngsters designated in the proposal----children in TMR, EMR and Track 4 classes, brain injured, doubly handicapped, physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed. The population serviced approximated the number which the project expected to train. In toto, the sample included 1,002 pupils in 150 classes in 27 school districts, ranging in age from five to twenty one years of age.

There was no evidence which indicated any cross referencing of this program to others in the schools being served.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the evaluation indicated pupils to have made significant gains in motor skills as a result of training, with pre and post program comparisons on a motor proficiency performance measure attaining significance at the .0054 level of confidence. A positive training effect was also evident for classroom teachers, who demonstrated increased knowledge and understanding of the program in pre and post comparisons of scores on a teacher questionnaire. Gains in the teacher group were apparent for every subject in the sample, indicating significance well beyond the .001 level of confidence. The program proved to have a comparable positive impact on parents as well, with the parent sample consistently rating the program favorably on a parent questionnaire.

Since the findings clearly point up the efficacy of this type of motor education for pupils, the evaluation warrants the conclusion that this training package is extremely worthwhile and should definitely be continued. In view of the success of this program, it is further concluded that an expansion of pupil services is justifiable, as well as a more extensive and intensive teacher training effort to disseminate methods of instruction developed by project staff. In line with these conclusions, the following specific recommendations are proposed :

(1) Enlarge services to handicapped youngsters to include additional classes of learning disabled pupils, especially children with perceptual difficulties and brain damage impairment. It is also suggested that services be offered to classes of blind pupils on a regular basis, who could benefit a great deal from this type of training.

(2) Expand the scope of teacher training to develop the skills of classroom teachers This might be done in several ways. One would be to set up an ongoing, demonstration laboratory school facility, which could provide continuous observation experience for special education teachers and prospective teachers . Such a facility would also serve the purpose of a setting for continuing curriculum experimentation and innovation. Another approach would be to sponsor an in-service seminar for graduate credit , open to classroom teachers as well as graduate students enrolled at metropolitan universities. In this connection, it would be helpful to arrange for internships at the model laboratory site on a semester basis, in conjunction with one of the urban college departments of education.

Component Code 64218 Activity Code 714 Objective Code 804

Chapter V: EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT BE # 09-56611

This motor education program was designed to improve the perceptual, motor/sensory abilities of handicapped children in the NYC schools. The sample included 1002 pupils, chiefly youngsters enrolled in CRMD classes, as well as other handicapped groups, ranging in age from five to twenty one years.

The program included three components(1) motor education training for pupils in selected schools (2) in-service training of classroom teachers attending these classes and periodic teacher workshops (3) parent education by way of parent workshops and specially designed training materials for parent guidance in the home.

The evaluation was directed toward assessing program impact with respect to these three components. Procedures included: pre and post training comparisons of pupil performance on an individually adminstered motor proficiency rating scale; pre and post comparisons of teachers' understanding and knowledge of the program, based on a teacher questionnaire; evaluation of parental reactions to the program in terms of response patterns on a parent questionnaire, administered once during the course of the program. Results of the pupil and teacher measures were analyzed by non-parametric techniques , the sign test in each instance. The parent data were analyzed descriptively in terms of response frequencies for various item categories and mean item scores.

The findings substantiated a positive program impact for all three components. Both pupils and teachers showed gains on the criterion

measures, which were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence for each group. Results for the parent sample demonstrated consistently favorable reactions to the program on all of the items in the questionnaire.

A number of factors seem to have contributed to the success of this training effort:

-- The competence, energy and enthusiasm of the project staff, which motivated both pupil and teacher involvement.

-- The excellence of the training curriculum, which was well planned from a developmental point of view, appropriate for ability levels of pupils and child-centered.

-- The variety, flexibility and appeal of the training materials, which were highly motivating and instructive.

-- The continuity of staff supervision and training, which was supportive to the trainers and facilitated their ability to function as a team.

APPENDIX

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

30D. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 30A, B or C, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
64218	720	812	52

Brief Description The Motor Proficiency Screening Test consists of nineteen activities used to measure a child's motor and physical fitness skills.

Number of cases observed: 876 Number of cases in treatment: 1002

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): same test

Criterion of success: .01 level of significance

Was objective fully met? Yes [X] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? Pre and post training comparisons of pupil scores on this measuring device showed a gain for the sample, with a sign test analysis indicating significance at the .0054 level of confidence.

Comments:

Teacher Training and Program Development in Motor Education for Handicapped Children in New York City Schools
09 - 56611

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

30D. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 30A, B or C, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
64218	718	804	52

Brief Description: The Parent Questionnaire consists of twelve Likert Scale items. The questions tap parental attitudes toward the program with respect to perceived value for their children.

Number of cases observed: 132 Number of cases in treatment: 132

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): There was no pre-treatment index, because it was inappropriate to evaluate parent reactions to the program prior to familiarity with it.

Criterion of success: Positive response profile on this questionnaire.

Was objective fully met? Yes [X] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? Response patterns were consistently favorable to all items for the entire parent sample.

Comments:

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

30D. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 30A, B or C, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
64218	714	804	52

Brief Description The Teacher Questionnaire consists of ten multiple choice items which measure teacher knowledge and understanding of the program. It was developed by project staff and is available at the Bureau for Children with Retarded Mental Devel.

Number of cases observed: 96 Number of cases in treatment: 178

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): Same questionnaire.

Criterion of success: .01 level of confidence

Was objective fully met? Yes [X] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? Sign test analysis of pre and post training score differences on this measure showed a gain for this group, significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

Comments:

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-56611

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
64218	720	11-20	Motor Proficiency Screening Test-	1002	876	126	.012	Sick, absent, transferred non-attendance, wouldnt cooperate	126
64218	714		Teacher Questionnaire-	178	96	82	.046	sick, failure to return test, transfers, tested last year	82
64218	718		Parent Questionnaire.	132	132				
20									

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

21

3/75

Teacher Training and Program Development in Motor Education for Handicapped Children in New York City Schools
09-56611

MOTOR PROFICIENCY SCREENING TEST

			I. BALANCE			II. LOCOMOTOR								III. AGILITY	IV. FITNESS					
	Height in Inches	Weight in Pounds	One Foot; 6 seconds	One Foot, Arms Folded; 4 seconds	One Foot, Arms Folded, Eyes Closed; 4 seconds	Crawl 15 feet	Walk 30 feet	Hop Forward 3 times	Jump Forward 3 times	Jump Backward 3 times	Hop Forward into Squares	Jump Forward into Squares	Jump Backward into Squares	Stand 1 second	Stiff Body Pull-ups 4-6 (under age 12)	Regular Pull-ups- 2 - (over age 12) boys only	Stiff Body Push-up, 5 - boys only	Knee Push-ups (girls) 8-10 count	Leg raise, 6-10 seconds	
	II	III	1	(2)	3	(4)	(5)	6	7	8	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(13A)	(14)	(14A)	(15)	

Items I, II, III- general information.

Circled items- used to determine motoric proficiency.

Uncircled items- general information.

RATING

3. Above average
2. Average
1. Below average
0. Can not perform

	IV. FITNESS (CONTINUED					V. THROWING			COMMENTS
	Bent Knee Sit-ups, 3-5	Shoulder Raise, 6-10 seconds	Broad Jump	Vertical Jump	Floor Touch	Shoulder Flex	Throw For Distance	Throw for Accuracy	Catch a 3 - inch ball	
	(15)	(17)	(18)	19	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	

09-56611

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Multiple choice: Please circle and fill in the appropriate response.

a.b.c. 1. To teach a physical education skill effectively, the following should take place:

a. Introduce equipment and allow child to explore.
b. Teacher demonstration and allow children to mimic movements.
c. Skill is broken down into its component parts using a variety of techniques progressing from simple to complex.

a.b.c. 2. Motor (Movement) Education involves:

a. problem solving approach (guided discovery only)
b. command approach
c. stimulus - response

a.b.c. 3. The following people have done extensive research in Motor Education. Circle the letter that is NOT included in this category.

a. Cratty
b. Kephart
c. Ling

a.b.c. 4. The Special Olympics is a

a. dance festival
b. track and field event
c. only conducted in the school

a.b.c. 5. Perceptual Motor skill development does not involve:

a. balance and maintenance of posture
b. auditory and visual skill development
c. social development

a.b.c. 6. Because a child is handicapped, he should be:

a. excluded from moto. ed. program
b. integrated into the motor ed. program
c. mainstreamed

a.b.c. 7. Activities that involve the concept of receipt and propulsion are:

a. throwing and catching
b. block building
c. calisthenics

a.b.c. 8. Activities that do not involve the concept of cognizant development are:

a. math skill development
b. concept development
c. individual and team sport activities

CDS/ak

09-56611

Board of Education of the City of New York
BUREAU FOR CHILDREN WITH RETARDED MENTAL DEVELOPMENT
65 Court Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
Madeline E. Dalton, Director

Teacher Training and Program Development
In Motor Education For the Handicapped Child

Neil Stoller
Coordinator

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE READ QUESTIONS CAREFULLY AND CHECK THE CATEGORY YOU FEEL APPROPRIATELY ANSWERS HOW YOU FEEL.

PARENT NAME: _____

School: _____

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENTS
1. The Motor Education Program is helping my child to become better coordinated and better skilled.						
2. The Motor Education Program has changed my child's attitudes about recreational activities in a positive manner.						
4. The materials that I have received from the Motor Education Program are not valuable and not appropriate for my child.						
5. The Motor Education Program is not helpful to my child's growth and development.						
6. My child does not look forward to participating in the Motor Education Program.						

26

27

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENTS
7. The Motor Education Program is helping my child improve in other areas such as reading & math.						
8. My child will be able to play better with other children as a result of this program.						
9. The equipment used in the program is not necessary, and a waste of money.						
10. The workshop in Motor Education for parents is a waste of time and not necessary.						
11. The workshops in Motor Education for parents are valuable and necessary.						
12. The Motor Education Program is not helping my child to become better coordinated and better skilled.						

NS:esc